

entering into this question? Can you not consult the wishes of the people of a State, as to a given exercise of power, without putting in jeopardy the power itself?

Sir, there are, in this case, many weighty considerations of expediency, aside of the constitutional point, which may be brought to bear upon this question.—The great purposes proposed by the establishment of this bank are, first to facilitate the financial operations of the Government—secondly, to regulate the currency of the country—and, thirdly, to furnish to such portions of the country as stand in need of it, an additional banking capital, in aid of its business. It is not apparent, inference to either of these objects, that the establishment of a branch in any State involves a grave question of expediency? Let me take for an example the humble State which I represent, in part, on this floor. It is clearly not necessary to the financial operations of the Government that a branch be established there. At the same time, we have as good a currency as ever existed—a currency entitled to, as it possesses, the confidence of all who are called upon to give it circulation. It requires no regulation from your projected Bank. And in my opinion, we have, at this moment, as much banking capital in existence as the wants and interests of the State requires. If this be so, would not the establishment of a Bank there, and the introduction of an additional banking capital, where it is not needed, be productive of the mischiefs of over-banking, and prove a positive evil? I cannot speak authoritatively on this point; perhaps it will be found expedient to establish a branch there. But it is not apparent, that as a mere question of expediency, it admits of doubt? The case may be the same with other States. Now, sir, who are more competent judges, on this point, than the local Legislature? They are, in my opinion, much better judges than we are; and I would hesitate before I would force a branch upon a State against its will, and I would hesitate still more, before I would confer upon the corporation you are about to create the power to do so.

The Senator from Rhode Island, following out the allusion of the Senator from Virginia, has compared this question to the controversy now pending between this country and Great Britain, in reference to the disputed territory; and he asks, whether, if we should occupy that territory, with the consent of Great Britain, it would not be a recognition of her rights. He argues that to ask the assent of the State in the case under consideration, would have the same effect. Without stopping to inquire whether the Senator be right or not in his views in relation to the disputed territory, I answer that he has pursued the comparison too far. The analogy does not hold. The question between us and Great Britain is a mere question of right. No consideration of expediency can enter into it. The question now before us is perhaps one of right, but it is combined with one of doubtful expediency. The omission to assert the right in one case is equivalent to the abandonment of it; but the omission to exercise political power in the other, may grow out of considerations of expediency alone.

But, sir, I will undertake to prove that this bill, even if modified as proposed by the Senator from Virginia, recognizes, as fully as we claim it, the power of Congress over this subject.

In the first place, the amendment itself contemplates the establishment of agencies within the several States, without their assent. This asserts the whole power: for if you may establish an agency to do the business of the Bank, how can you distinguish between one form of banking and another? If your agent can lawfully deal in exchange, by what refinement upon the Constitution is it made out that you cannot empower him to deal in promissory notes? If he may purchase a bill, can he not constitutionally discount a bill? If you can confer upon him any banking powers, why can you not confer all?

Again, the bill makes it imperative upon the corporation to establish branches in any State, whenever requested by the State. Does not this language import, most unequivocally, that the branches are established under your authority—by force of your charter? Do you not, by this, not only create a corporation, but require that corporation to exercise its corporate powers within the State? And how can the State request of the corporation the exercise of its power, without admitting the legislative existence of that power?

But this is not all. You assert the power in its full extent when you create the principal Bank. The Senator from Virginia considers the location of the principal Bank in this District, as obviating the constitutional objection. In my view of the subject, this location has no bearing upon the question of power. But this is one of those differences of opinion which I regard as not essential to our present purpose. The location of the mother Bank I consider practically unimportant; and if I rely on the Senator from Virginia, I cheerfully yield the point; because, by doing so, my great purpose is answered without encountering similar difficulties on my part. But my object, in discussing this motion, is to show to my political friends that no surrender of constitutional power is involved in this concession.

Sir, Congress, as the legislative body of the Union, has certain specified powers conferred upon it by the Constitution. It possesses also, by force of the same instrument, the power of exclusive legislation over the District of Columbia. These two branches of power are, in their nature, separate and distinct, and cannot be blended. Your limited power of legislation over the common interests of the Union can never be enlarged by borrowing from your more extensive power over those of the District. Every act of Congress is referable to one or the other of these powers. Whether it be an exercise of one or the other, depends upon the nature and object of the act and the interest to be operated upon. When you legislate for the interests of the people of this District alone, it is the exercise of your power of local legislation. But when you legislate for those great national interests committed to your legislative guardianship, you act as the Legislature of the Union, under a grant of limited power, and you cannot transcend those limits by virtue of your local authority. Now what is this Bank which we propose to create? In this place, it is a great financial agent to operate, not merely in this District, but throughout the nation; wherever in short, you have a revenue to collect, or a revenue to disburse. Its operation here is to be trivial; it is to operate, principally, nay, almost exclusively, elsewhere. How can you refer this act, which is a means employed by you to carry into effect your general power over the revenues of the nation, to your local jurisdiction? It is to operate also upon the commerce and currency of the country at large. Are not these national objects? And when you legislate for them, are you not in the exercise of the powers conferred upon you for the furtherance of these great national interests? In my judgment, the location of the Bank is unimportant, so far as the constitutional question is concerned. The Bank, if created at all, is to be created for national purposes; and if authority for its creation is to be found in the Constitution, it is found among the powers conferred for those purposes, and not in our local jurisdiction.

Entertaining this opinion, and conceiving that the measure, as proposed to be modified, must stand upon the power which I claim, and cannot be sustained upon the footing of local authority, I surrender no principle in sustaining the proposed amendment.

Sir, a vast majority of the people of my State have as little doubt on this subject as I have. It may, at first, excite surprise in them to find their representative here voting for a proposition, which is supposed, by any one, to throw a doubt over this power. But I have explained my motives. I desire harmony and concert of action in relation to this great measure; and I submit my course on this occasion, very cheerfully, to the deliberate judgment of my constituents. I do so with great confidence, as I know them to be people who look to practical results, and who will never trouble their brains with abstractions not essential to their purpose.

A NEW LOCOFOCO SONG.

Within a few weeks the locofocos from John C. Calhoun in Congress to orator Laird in the late local Convention in this County, have strung their harps for a new song. It is, that the times are bad, wool low, and money scarce. Now we will not say as they were wont to that there "is no pressure that any honest man ought to regret," for we think otherwise. We think that the scheme consummated by Van Buren the 4th of July 1840, has not proved so beneficial as even its supporters thought it would, and surely it works very much as the Whigs predicted. Although it had by its operations up to the 4th inst. curtailed the currency of the country only one fourth, its effects have been visible, and a gradual reduction towards the European standard has taken place, even according to the admission of the friends of the Sub Treasury. The rate of exchange, which indicated the condition of the great business of the country, range from 15 to 20 per cent. between the South, West and East, when before locofocoism prevailed, it was only 1 per cent. And if the provisions of this law are suffered to go into force, when all paper money is to be proscribed, we shall, at the rate it has gone on, reach the "European standard," and the prices of hard money nations become our prices.

What then was predicted by the Whigs one year ago as the fruits of this measure, receiving the acknowledgments of their opponents now as true, has become serious reality. And who does not feel this reality?

But there is another note to the Locofoco song. It is that the Whigs have not improved the times. They forget that the people well understand that the new administration has not had time to repeal even the Sub Treasury and to provide the means of relief and that they well know we are still burdened with that ruinous system.

So badly has this scheme operated that even the chattering influence which the succession of another administration was calculated to produce, has been in a great measure, if not altogether, counteracted.

Yet the Van Burenites stick to this scheme, pass resolutions in its favor, denounce and oppose the Whigs in the adoption of those measures from which alone relief and prosperity can be expected.

We are still living under the measures established by Van Buren and his party, and must so live till these measures can be abolished, and to do this constitutionally and rightly requires time. Had we a king or an administration that would take the responsibility of dispersing with these laws at once, after the fashion of some who dared to abrogate such laws as they chose, then these measures could have been set aside; but our constitution forbids this, and a succeeding administration is compelled to maintain laws previously enacted till time is allowed Congress to repeal them and to mature different and better laws. All this requires patience and consideration.

BISHOP DOANE.—The London Morning Herald of July 3d contains an account of the examination of the students of King's College School, London, which took place on the 1st and 2d inst. Among others present on the occasion was the Rev. Bishop Doane, of New Jersey, formerly of this city. After the exercises were concluded, "the Chairman," says the Herald, "in concluding a suitable address to the scholars, remarked that there was one person present on the occasion whose sanction they ought to be proud of, who had a birthright in our country and in our literature. A brother in the faith and a father in the church—the Right Rev. the Bishop of New Jersey. He assured that eminent person that his presence gave himself and all those interested in these proceedings the sincerest gratification—(long and loud applause.)"

To these remarks Bishop Doane replied in an exceedingly happy and appropriate manner. His speech is reported at length in the Herald, and we regret that the narrow limits of our columns will not permit us to copy it.—*Boston Times.*

EXECUTIVE DICTATION.

Gentlemen:—For the last 12 years the country has been convulsed and agitated at the great strides of the Executive usurpation over the Constitution, laws and legislation and from which, more than any other, has the patriot had most cause to tremble for the fate of our beloved institutions. When Gen. Jackson first assumed his dictatorial career, and attempted to make every thing bow down to his tyrannical will, I swore undying hostility to Executive prerogative, and from that time have labored, in season and out of season, to crush this fatal bane of a Republican Government. You may think me peculiarly transcendental on the subject—but I do consider all the hue and cry raised about state rights—strict construction—abolition—latitudinarianism, &c.—mere humbug—moonshine, compared with it. We are all aware of what it has done—let us attempt to guard against it in future by every possible means.

I have been led to these reflections by the recent demonstrations given out at Washington, that the President will veto the bank bill, provided it is passed as originally reported by Mr. Clay, and it is pretty clear this demonstration is "ascertained fact."

Now if this is true, that John Tyler has intimated that he will veto this or any other measure, thereby to dictate or overawe the action of Congress, I hereby declare "uncompromising hostility" to him, now, henceforth and forever. I care not a copper about the veto, so far as its constitutionality or expediency is concerned. But when it is used to influence legislative action, it is most odious! Who does not remember not only its tyrannical use but its influence by General Jackson? With what unblushing impudence his parasites proclaimed on the floor of Congress that he would veto such and such measures which did not suit the state of his gracious majesty, and

would not "enure" to the benefit of party?

Messrs. Editors—this influence must be met at the very threshold—it must be frowned down by the Whigs, at once, or they will be false to their principles and their profession. For one I can never submit to it, no matter how favorable it may be to any measures I may have at heart. It is an inherent principle in every Whig to spurn dictation—and you may set him down as an unworthy disciple, who will submit to it from any power, save the Almighty.

AN INDOMITABLE WHIG.

27TH CONGRESS—1st Session.

Correspondence of the Journal.

WASHINGTON, July 19, 1841.

The House occupied the day in the discussion of the fortification bill, in committee of the whole. In the Senate, the loan bill was passed, and it now awaits only the signature of the President to become a law. It passed the Senate by a party vote! Yes, the extraordinary spectacle was presented of a full party vote against voting the supplies necessary to sustain the credit and honor of the nation. When there was not money in the treasury to meet the current demands of a single week, the whole opposition—with the late Secretary of the Treasury, whose extravagant administration had reduced his department to the verge of bankruptcy, at their head—united against granting a cent to meet the engagements of the government. When eight millions of treasury notes, authorized and issued by the late administration, were hanging over an empty treasury, a treasury called upon to pay the debts of their own extravagant and profligate rule, these men voted against a bill of supplies! Mr. Benton made a long speech, which had no bearing upon the subject, but being, as he said, intended for his constituents, might as well be delivered at one time as another. Mr. Calhoun almost avowed his motive to embarrass the government, and said that the demand for a loan argued a want of economy in the present Secretary of the Treasury! He never supposed that any portion of the embarrassment was owing to the men who found the treasury with an immense surplus and left it with a heavy debt.

CORRESPONDENCE OF THE EXPRESS.

WASHINGTON, Friday Evening, July 23.

The proceedings in Congress to day will attract the attention of the readers of the Express. Next to the engrossment of the Bankruptcy Bill in the Senate by the strong vote of 27 to 22, and which is decisive of its passage in that body, is the action upon the resolutions in the House in favor of a Committee of Investigation, to sit during the recess, for the purpose of obtaining information upon the subject of Revenue duties, and the operations of the Compromise Act.

The discussion of this resolution has opened the whole subject of the Tariff, and led to the avowal of many important opinions upon the subject of free trade and protection. The opposition members of the House, particularly those from South of the Potomac, stand upon the broad ground of DIRECT TAXATION AND FREE TRADE. Mr. Rhett of South Carolina who is an exponent of Carolina Locofocoism, avowed, during the last Congress, that "Direct Taxation was not only the Democracy, but the doctrine of the Constitution." To day he goes one step further, and, in the most unqualified terms, stands forth in defence of the creed that "DIRECT TAXATION AND FREE TRADE are the principles of peace and liberty, and of every conceivable virtue. Never have I heard a bad doctrine more zealously defended, and it comes not only from that hot-bed of Calhounism in South Carolina, but from the city of New York, and one of her representatives, Mr. McKee, has waded up to his eyes in free trade theories, and is so deep in the mire that he would abolish every sort of protection for commerce, agriculture and manufactures, and no doubt, in the words of a member from Ohio, substitute, in place of protection even to the necessity of revenue, the creed of "Perish Credit," "Perish Commerce," "Perish our State Institutions!" Mr. McKee is opposed not only to all taxation for protection, and for revenue as I judge, since he is for supporting the government by Direct Taxation, but opposed also to all corresponding or retaliatory duties.

Extract from a Letter of a gentleman in Washington:

WASHINGTON, July 23, 1841

To the Editors of the Express: Yesterday I presented to the President the memorial of the Board of Trade for a National Bank, and he received it most politely, and entered with great interest and freely into mutual conversation upon its objects. He believes as much as city men the necessity of a National Bank, and especially one that will regulate the exchanges, which is the ground taken in the memorial. Without such an institution the country could not return to its wanted prosperity. Mr. Tyler is as good "a Bank man," as I want to meet with. You may depend upon this, in opposition to the private letter writers and suspicions to the contrary. He was in fine spirits and fine health.

Mr. Clay defends his bill ably. He is certainly a most astonishing man. Alone in the Senate, without calling upon the aid of his auxiliaries, he conquers the attack of its enemies from Calhoun down to the smallest opposition capacity in that political arena. Whether he carries his bill or not, this Congress will add new laurels to his greatness and patriotism. A Senator told me last evening that Mr. Clay that day had informed him that a compromise on the subject would probably take place, so as to harmonize all the friends of the measure. So you see we need not fear but that we will have a National Bank.

G. P. D.

HOUSE.

July 26.

Mr. Fillmore rose and moved that the House resolve itself into a committee of the whole; on the request of Mr. Pickens, he withdrew from various members took place on the subject of presenting petitions. Mr. F. again renewed his motion to go into a com-

mittee; carried in the affirmative, ayes 66 noes 60.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Dickens, their Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed a bill for a uniform system of bankruptcy, and withdrew. Mr. Cushing took the chair, and Mr. Lawrence, of Pa. proceeded to address the Chair, by moving to strike out the articles of tea and coffee from the proposed duty of 20 per cent. He stated, that the quantity of tea imported annually, was about 20 millions of pounds, valued at \$5,419,589, that of coffee about 95 millions, valued at \$8,546,222. The proposed 20 per cent duty on teas \$1,083,517.80; and the proposed duty on coffee, \$1,709,244.40. (at present there is no duty on either coffee or tea.)

Mr. Fillmore explained the operation of the proposed bill, and took occasion, in defence of the bill, to remark that the greater part of the British duties were levied on only three articles, sugar, tea and tobacco; that the consumption of coffee in Great Britain was not more than one pound a-head, whereas, in the United States, it was about five pounds a-head. He dwelt on the difficulty of collecting duties on jewellery, owing to the facility of smuggling articles of that description, incidentally remarking, that our duties on jewellery were, at this time, higher than those of Great Britain.

Mr. Lawrence resumed, that he would not now attempt to discuss whether tea or coffee should be classed amongst the necessities of life—they were not his favorites. Common consent and universal usage had made them necessary to the comfort of every family, and he would not attempt to reform the public taste—he would be the last to war against public opinion. As to the general provisions of the bill, he was in favor of them, and would sustain any reasonable measures to provide a revenue, but in doing this, he could not consent to raise it from the necessities of life. Luxuries, silks, gold watches, jewellery, and such other articles, and those that competed with our domestic productions, but by all means to allow the poor and industrious the necessities of life, without the load of import duties.

Mr. Dawson of Geo. threw in some explanation in behalf of Mr. Nesbitt, his colleague.

Mr. Ward of New York, rose and made his first speech this session, in opposition to the call and in reply to Mr. Fillmore, he went into a minute examination of the condition of the finances, referred to their condition in Mr. Van Buren's administration: denied as had, been asserted, that they had ever fairly swelled up thirty-seven millions in that period; ran over the various disbursements, designating the description of funds from which expenditures had been made—erection of Custom Houses, Florida War South Pole Expedition, and dwelt on the value of the revenue from the Compromise Act.

Mr. John Q. Adams, of Mass. rose to take exception to the course of Mr. Ward's remarks, gave a history of the birth of the Compromise Act, denounced it as a bargain between two parties to which New England interests was not privy, referred to the course of the nullifiers on the tariff, and the decided opposition they had received at the hands of the President Jackson—adding many facts on the compromise act that he joyously said Mr. W. had forgot; complimented the exertions of Mr. Clay in bringing it about, and Mr. Webster's address on the subject to the New England manufacturers, that the compromise act in fact originated in the other House that when this unparliamentary procedure was detected, it was brought privately into the House of Representatives, and incorporated into another bill then under consideration, by Mr. Letcher at whose instance it was hurried through without giving members leave to read it over—it was then incorporated without consent at the expense of New-England manufacturers. It is hardly possible in a glance to do the least justice to Mr. A's very interesting remarks, on the improvements of the States he was patriotic and just in his observations. He asked with what the New Hampshire could refer to expenditures on internal improvements—she who never spent a dollar. Was it not money well laid out improving and enlarging our resources—linking the Union together—giving trade and happiness to millions—the true road to social and political greatness.

Mr. Holmes, of South Carolina, moved the Committee rise, &c., which they did, had leave to sit again.

Adjourned till to-morrow at 10 o'clock.

Correspondence of the New York Express.

Washington, Monday Evening, July 28.

The discussion upon the Revenue Bill has been conducted to-day with good temper, and a speech from Mr. Adams has been received with general favor, and which surprised and pleased every member of the House for the intimate knowledge displayed in it in regard to the tariff, the compromise act, and the whole subject of revenue duties. The members listened with undivided attention, and it was the unanimous wish of the members that the President would "go on" after he had consumed the hour allotted to him under the rule of the House. Mr. Adams declined either to avoid or infringe upon the rule, for the reason that that he had voted for it and deemed it a most salutary measure. An effort will be made to persuade Mr. Adams to continue his remarks, so deep is the impression left by his off-hand speech of to-day. It is always so, whatever the subject under debate, and no man has so extensive knowledge of the matter debated, whatever it is, and none an equal influence. The immediate proposition before the House is in relation to a duty upon tea and coffee. The Revenue Bill under consideration proposes a tax within the terms of the Compromise Act. The amendment proposed asks for the admission of both articles free from duty. Should it be adopted, it will take three millions of dollars from the receipts contemplated under the Bill. If it is retained the tax will be a small one—less than two cents a pound on coffee, and about 4 or 5 on tea. To tea and coffee Mr. Pickens proposes to add salt and some other articles,—to salt will be added something else,—and so on, until the articles enumerated for taxation within the terms of the Compromise will all be named for an exemption to the Bill. I have already said that whether the Land Bill passes or not, the Revenue will be necessary; and to the full amount of the \$18,000,000 which it is anticipated will be received by the Bill of the Committee of Ways and Means.—There exists, therefore, a necessity for passing the Bill as it is reported.

Out of Congress the news has but little interest.—The President attended to-day the anniversary of the Georgetown College. A great many visitors were present. Yours, &c., E. B.

THE NEWS FROM WASHINGTON.

ANOTHER CONSULTATION OF THE WHIG SENATORS.—A BANK BILL SUBSTANTIALLY AGREED UPON.—PASSAGE OF THE BANKRUPT ACT IN THE SENATE.—NO DIVISIONS IN THE ADMINISTRATION.

We are happy in being able to announce, that on Friday night, the Whig Senators in Congress held a consultation in which the principles of a Bank Bill that all, or all but two Whig Senators would vote for, were agreed upon. There was no doubt also that the President would approve such a Bill as was there proposed, or that the Cabinet would agree to, and recommend his approval of it.

The substance of the compromise we have before announced in the Express. The power to establish Branches will be asserted, and can be exercised, with the assent of Congress, if deemed necessary. In the meantime, the assent of the States, direct or implied, will be required.

We are happy also to be able to state, that this concord and agreement of the Whig Senators have imparted the liveliest satisfaction in the political circles at Washington, and that now hardly the shadow of a doubt exists that Congress will create a Bank which the President can approve, and which will also satisfy the commercial classes of the country.

In the meantime, as we remark that a meeting of Whigs is to be assembled this evening, to act upon the subject of the Bank, we would command these facts to their attention, to press upon them the importance of doing nothing inconsiderately, but of waiting for the end of events in progress at Washington.

The passage of a bankrupt act in the Senate by so decisive a majority must afford the liveliest satisfaction to the thousands and hundreds of thousands interested in that great act of national liberality and beneficence, if not of national emancipation.

The motion of the Opposition to amend the bill so as to include State corporations, was rejected by a vote of 34 to 18.

There are no divisions in the administration, we can assure our readers. The story of a quarrel between the President and the Secretary of the Treasury respecting the dismissal of some clerks in the Land office, hardly has a peg to hang upon. There may have been some conversation upon the subject, some friendly interchange of opinion, and no doubt there was, but there was no quarrel nor approach to a quarrel, and no two men, we are well assured, can have a higher respect, the one for the other, than the President and his Secretary, of the Treasury.

The Whigs have only to wait, to stand by each other, and to look out sharply for the disappointed and the so-called, and all will come out right in the end. The extra session will be no abortion. The House has already done wonders, and the Senate now the principles of a Bank Bill are agreed upon, will soon catch up.

HARMONY AT WASHINGTON.—The Intelligence, alluding to rumors of difficulty between the President and members of the Cabinet, says there is no foundation to justify them, and adds: "Those rumors are too often mere fumes of the enemy which the Whig sentinels should always be upon their guard against being deceived by. So far from the above rumor being true, an entire and perfect harmony exists between the President and the Heads of Departments, themselves."

'WHO IS NATHAN SMILEY?'

A native of Haverhill, Mass., and son of a mechanic who owned a small farm and lots of children, and brought up the latter to habits of industry: a good father, surely, and if we had him here, he might make a good governor.—We would take him at a venture in preference to the son. But, to return: the son had a common school education until 21, and for five or six years spent his time in working by the month and attending a high school, in this time making a few hundred dollars, with which he purchased a lot of land on the banks of the La-moille, and in 12 years made money enough to start in the mercantile business—(men. folks who sell broadcloth, rum, silks, tobacco, calicoes, and snuff, invariably prove recreant to democracy and become blue-light federalists and Tories.) If you don't believe it, ask Mr. Van Ness.) For the last 15 or 16 years he has divided his time between his farm and his store, until recently, the Vt. Patriot suspects, that he has quit the store altogether for the farm. "And what is singular indeed, in all this time, he has never received a bank accommodation (except from the bank of earth), for the purpose of speculation, or any other." For the above intelligence we are indebted to the Patriot. To it that paper might have added, that Mr. Smiley is a locofoco of the destructive sort—perfectly rabid against all banks—an ill-natured and illiberal politician, and of too contracted views to embrace within his vision even the most prominent and vital interests of the people of his adopted State. He is not only a relentless hater of all banks, state and national, but we believe of all incorporated associations for manufacturing or any thing else, and is withal opposed to the tariff, opposed to the land bill, opposed to almost every thing and every body but himself, and loco focoism, of which, in its widest vagaries, he is the impersonation. This is the opinion we have formed, after a pretty long acquaintance with his course and character as a legislator. As a citizen, we have no objection to make against him; but as a politician, he is such that no Whig, and we think no man of any party who has a just view of the best interests of the people of the state, can support him.—*Watchman & Journal.*

Col. Paine is a federalist because he is the son of his father, quoth the North Star.

This reminds us of an incident that occurred in our perambulations a couple of years since. Tarrying over night at the Capital of the State, we rose early that we might secure the first services of the village barber to avoid the inconvenience of "hope deferred." As we approached the sign of the pole we overtook a venerable gentleman apparently about 75 years of age, dressed in the costume of the "days of old lang syne"—breeches and silver knee buckles—of an open and generous countenance, who responded cheerfully to our reverent salu-

ation of "good morning." We soon found that we had encountered a man of good breeding—of intelligence—a gentleman indeed of the old school—and made up our mind for a rich intellectual treat. Some modest allusion of ours to the past, his age &c. intimating that he came down to us from another generation, touched his heart, and we saw at once that the fountain of his soul was broken up and his words flowed as he spoke of Washington—the time of the revolution—of our dearly bought independence. He narrated graphically the enduring patience of the American Army, especially as exhibited in their gloomy retreat through the "Jerseys"—the battle of Mounmouth the scenes of Bergen—and his soul seemed fired with the ardour of youth. We more than suspected that he participated in some of these scenes, and in reply to a query of ours he modestly answered that he did, that he served his country in the Revolution, under the immortal Washington; and that although entitled to a pension equally with the small remnant now remaining of that glorious band of heroes who periled their lives in that sad hour of their country's history, he, having acquired a sufficiency from his own toil for his support, had never asked for it. Here, reader, was a Whig of the Revolution; and his name was ELIAH PAINE, of Northfield, the father of Col. Charles Paine, the candidate of the democratic Whig party of Vermont for the office of Governor.—*Caedonian.*

PEOPLE'S PRESS.

Tuesday Morning, Aug. 3, 1841.

WHIG NOMINATIONS.

FOR GOVERNOR,
CHARLES PAINE,
OF NORTHFIELD,
FOR LIEUT. GOVERNOR,
WAITSTILL R. RANNEY,
OF WINDHAM,
FOR TREASURER,
JOHN SPAULDING,
OF MONTPELIER.
SENATORS,
—
ADDISON COUNTY.
ELIAS BOTTOM,
DORASTUS WOOSTER,
ISAAC CHIPMAN.

NEXT GOVERNOR.—With a single exception the entire whig press of Vermont has adopted the ticket regularly nominated at Montpelier. Still there does not seem to prevail through the state, that cordiality, unanimity and zeal in sustaining the nominees, so desirable to secure to it that triumphant success, which the numerical superiority of the whig party might give it. And for this we are sure no adequate reason can be assigned. The convention which made the nomination was regularly called, and in number, talents and intelligence was highly respectable; and although, there was found some discrepancy of opinion, an harmonious feeling at length prevailed, and the ticket was adopted and agreed to be supported with great unanimity. No whig in the state should now complain that the convention did not as fairly express the wishes of the whig party, as any ever assembled upon a similar occasion. If any portion of the whigs stayed at home in careless apathy, when they might have been, present, they should adopt the candidate whom they have entrusted others to designate for them, and not endanger the unity of the party by after murmurs and complaints?

Have the whigs of Vermont lost all sense of the necessity of that discipline which the victories of their less powerful opponents have taught them to respect? Will they the moment the common enemy ceases to press them to the wall, fall at once into disruptions, and like silly daws, cruelly pluck each other, while the vulture is ready to pounce upon both with an indiscriminate vengeance? By union, we overthrow a dynasty which corruption had rendered almost invincible, and by union alone can we perpetuate the victory.—Let us then have union, immediate concentration of our strength upon the candidate designated by the usages of the party, Standing as we do, in the presence of a foe who is now chuckling at the prospect of recruiting his broken ranks from our dissensions, an undivided and unbroken front is of vastly more consequence to us than the elevation of any individual to office. All mere preference for men must be yielded, rather than in the least endanger the great interests which the people have so nobly struggled to sustain. We trust in Heaven, that the whigs of the Green Mountains have not become so lost to the dignity of their principles, and the obvious means of sustaining them, as to separate upon the question, whether Charles Paine, or Charles K. Williams shall occupy the comparatively insignificant office of governor of the state.—There should be no party, but for the country. We go, then, for union, for practical union, and we pronounce it folly, madness and a political crime of the first magnitude, for any portion of the whig party to declare, without the most urgent considerations, against a nomination made by a regular convention of the state.

THE REGULAR NOMINATION.—Independent of his being the regularly nominated can-